

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Parity, breastfeeding and risk of coronary heart disease: A pan-European case-cohort study

This is a pre print version of the following article:

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1624631> since 2020-02-28T15:32:28Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1177/2047487316658571

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

Parity, breastfeeding and risk of coronary heart disease: a pan-European case-cohort study

Sanne A.E. Peters,^{1,2} Yvonne T. van der Schouw,² Angela M. Wood,^{3,4} Michael J. Sweeting,^{3,4} Karel G.M. Moons,² Elisabete Weiderpass,^{5,6,7,8} Larraitz Arriola,⁹ Vassiliki Benetou,^{10,11} Heiner Boeing,¹² Salma T. Butt,¹³ Françoise Clavel-Chapelon,¹⁴ Isabel Drake,¹⁵ Diana Gavrilă,^{16,17} Timothy J Key,¹⁸ Eleni Klinaki,¹¹ Vittorio Krogh,¹⁹ Tilman Kühn,²⁰ Camille Lassale,²¹ Giovanna Masala,²² Giuseppe Matullo,^{23,24} Melissa Merritt,²¹ Elena Molina-Portillo,^{19,25} Conchi Moreno-Iribas,^{26,27} Therese H. Nøst,⁵ Anja Olsen,²⁸ N. Charlotte Onland-Moret,² Kim Overvad,^{29,30} Salvatore Panico,³¹ M Luisa Redondo,³² Anne Tjønneland,²⁸ Antonia Trichopoulou,^{10,11} Rosario Tumino,³³ Renée Turzanski-Fortner,²⁰ Ioanna Tzoulaki,²¹ Maria Wennberg,³⁴ Patrik Wennberg,³⁴ Simon G. Thompson,^{3,4} Emanuele Di Angelantonio,^{3,4} Elio Riboli,²¹ Nicholas J. Wareham,³⁵ John Danesh,^{3,4} Adam S. Butterworth^{3,4,36}

*Denotes authors are listed alphabetically

1. The George Institute for Global Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
2. Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, the Netherlands
3. Cardiovascular Epidemiology Unit, Department of Public Health & Primary Care, University of Cambridge, UK
4. The National Institute for Health Research Blood and Transplant Unit (NIHR BTRU) in Donor Health and Genomics at the University of Cambridge, UK
5. Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Tromsø, The Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway
6. Department of Research, Cancer Registry of Norway, Oslo, Norway
7. Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
8. Genetic Epidemiology Group, Folkhälsan Research Center, Helsinki, Finland
9. Public Health Division of Gipuzkoa, Instituto Bio-Donostia, Basque Government, CIBERESP, Spain
10. WHO Collaborating Center for Nutrition and Health, Unit of Nutritional Epidemiology and Nutrition in Public Health, Department of Hygiene, Epidemiology and Medical Statistics, University of Athens Medical School, Athens, Greece
11. Hellenic Health Foundation, Athens, Greece
12. Department of Epidemiology, German Institute of Human Nutrition (DIfE), Potsdam-Rehbrücke, Germany
13. Department of Surgery, Clinical Sciences, Lund University, Skåne University Hospital, Malmö, Sweden
14. INSERM, Centre for Research in Epidemiology and Population Health (CESP), U1018, Nutrition, Hormones, and Women's Health Team, Institut Gustave Roussy, Villejuif, France
15. Department of Clinical Science, Lund University, Malmö, Sweden
16. Department of Epidemiology, Murcia Regional Health Council, IMIB-Arrixaca, Murcia, Spain
17. CIBER Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Spain
18. Cancer Epidemiology Unit, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford
19. Epidemiology and Prevention Unit, Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori, Milan, Italy
20. German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), Division of Cancer Epidemiology, Heidelberg, Germany
21. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Imperial College London, London, UK
22. Molecular and Nutritional Epidemiology Unit, Cancer Research and Prevention Institute - ISPO, Florence, Italy
23. Human Genetics Foundation, Turin, Italy
24. Department of Medical Sciences, University of Turin, Italy
25. Escuela Andaluza de Salud Pública. Instituto de Investigación Biosanitaria ibs.GRANADA. Hospitales Universitarios de Granada/Universidad de Granada, Granada, Spain
26. Public Health Institute of Navarra, Pamplona, Spain
27. Red de Investigación en Servicios de Salud en Enfermedades Crónicas, Madrid, Spain
28. Diet, Genes and Environment, Danish Cancer Society Research Center, Copenhagen, Denmark

- 45 29. Department of Public Health, Section for Epidemiology, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark
46 30. Department of Cardiology, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark
47 31. Dipartimento di Medicina Clinica e Chirurgia, Federico II University, Naples, Italy
48 32. Public Health Directorate, Asturias, Spain
49 33. Cancer Registry and Histopathology Unit, Civic- M.P.Arezzo Hospital, ASP Ragusa , Italy
50 34. Nutritional Research, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
51 35. Medical Research Council Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
52 36. Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute, Genome Campus, Hinxton, UK

53 Address for correspondence

54 Dr. Sanne A.E. Peters
55 The George Institute for Global Health, University of Oxford
56 34 Broad Street, Oxford OX1 3BD, United Kingdom
57 T: +44 1865 617 200 | F: +44 1865 617 202
58 E: sanne.peters@georgeinstitute.ox.ac.uk

59 **Abstract**

60 *Aim:* There is uncertainty about the direction and magnitude the associations between parity, breastfeeding and the risk of
61 coronary heart disease (CHD). We examined the separate and combined associations of parity and breastfeeding practices
62 with the incidence of CHD later in life among women in a large pan-European cohort study.

63 *Methods:* Data were used from EPIC-CVD, a case-cohort study nested within the EPIC prospective study of 520,000
64 participants from 10 countries. Information on reproductive history was available for 14,917 women, including 5,138 incident
65 cases of CHD. Using Prentice-weighted Cox regression stratified by country, we calculated hazard ratios (HRs) and 95%
66 confidence intervals (CIs) for CHD, after adjustment for age, study centre, and several socioeconomic and biological risk
67 factors.

68
69 *Results:* Compared with nulliparous women, the adjusted HR was 1.19 (95% CI: 1.03-1.38) among parous women; HRs were
70 higher among women with more children (e.g., adjusted HR: 1.04, 1.27-3.27, for women with ≥ 5 children). Compared with
71 women who did not breastfeed, the adjusted HR was 0.70 (0.50-0.97) among women who breastfed. For childbearing women
72 who never breastfed, the adjusted HR was 1.27 (0.72-2.24) compared with nulliparous women, whereas for childbearing
73 women who breastfed the adjusted HR was 0.92 (0.62-1.37).

74
75 *Conclusion:* Having more children was associated with a higher risk of CHD later in life, whereas breastfeeding was associated
76 with a lower CHD risk. Women who both had children and breastfed did not have a higher risk of CHD.

77 **Introduction**

78 Pregnancy is associated with profound changes in the maternal metabolic system, including weight gain, accumulation of
79 abdominal fat, increased insulin resistance, and higher circulating lipid levels.^{1,2} While these metabolic changes of pregnancy
80 support the growth of the foetus and prepare the mother's body for breastfeeding in the short-term, they may also have a
81 prolonged effect on maternal risk of cardiovascular diseases (CVD). However, previous studies have reported conflicting
82 associations on parity (i.e., the number of live children to whom a woman has given birth) and risk of CVD later in life.³⁻¹⁰

83 Conversely, since the metabolic changes in pregnancy appear to reverse more quickly and more completely with
84 breastfeeding, it has been proposed that breastfeeding could reduce maternal risk of cardiometabolic diseases.¹¹ Studies
85 have reported that, compared with women who have never breastfed, women who have breastfed have favourable
86 cardiometabolic profiles,^{12,13} and exhibit a lower burden of subclinical cardiovascular disease.¹⁴ There may be a lower risk of
87 developing metabolic syndrome,¹⁵ hypertension,^{16,17} and type 2 diabetes¹⁸⁻²¹ among women who have breastfed for longer
88 cumulative durations. However, it is uncertain whether there is an association between breastfeeding and incident CVD
89 outcomes.^{10,22-24} Also, while lifetime duration of breastfeeding will be affected by the number of children, it is unknown
90 whether extended duration of breastfeeding for one child is associated with the same extent of inverse association with CHD
91 risk as multiple periods of shorter breastfeeding across several pregnancies. Moreover, whether breastfeeding could
92 compensate for the potential effect of parity on CHD risk has not been examined.

93 The EPIC (European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition)-CVD study provides an opportunity to
94 address these outstanding issues and to evaluate the separate and combined associations of parity and breastfeeding on the
95 risk of incident CHD in a large sample of women from diverse European countries.

96
97 **Methods**

98 EPIC-CVD is a large, prospective, case-cohort study nested within the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and
99 Nutrition (EPIC) study.^{25,26} Briefly, the EPIC study involves 366,521 women and 153,457 men, mostly aged 35–70 years,
100 recruited by 23 centres in 10 European countries (Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain,
101 Sweden, and the United Kingdom) between 1991 and 1999. Participants completed questionnaires on their diet, lifestyle, and
102 medical history, and data were centralized at the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) in Lyon, France. A
103 representative random subcohort of 18,249 participants (62% women), stratified by centre, was selected for the EPIC-CVD
104 project.²⁷ After exclusion of 609 participants with a prior history of myocardial infarction or stroke at baseline, 17,640
105 subcohort members remained. This study complied with the Declaration of Helsinki; ethical review boards of IARC and all
106 local institutions where participants had been recruited gave approval for the study, and all participants gave written
107 informed consent.

Definition and ascertainment of CHD events

First-time CHD events, whether non-fatal or fatal, as defined by codes 410-414 of the International Classification of Diseases Ninth Edition (ICD-9), and codes I20-I25 of the Tenth Edition (ICD-10) were the primary study endpoint. Individual centres used different methods to ascertain first-time non-fatal CHD events, including self-report and linkage with morbidity or hospital registries. Non-fatal CHD events were further validated by additional review of medical records and/or linkage with registries.²⁶ Fatal CHD events were generally ascertained through mortality registries. End of follow-up for CHD events varied between centres and ranged between 2003 and 2010.

Study population and measurement

Of the 16,504 women in EPIC-CVD who did not have a known history of CHD or stroke at baseline and 14,917 women provided data on reproductive history. Two EPIC centres (Bilthoven, the Netherlands, and Umea, Sweden) did not assess parity and breastfeeding history and thus did not contribute to the analyses. Reproductive history, socioeconomic and lifestyle factors, and medical history were assessed once using a self-administrated questionnaire at study baseline. Trained health professionals measured blood pressure, weight, height, and waist circumference during a visit to each study centre, except in the France and Oxford centres where anthropometry was self-reported. Blood pressure measurements were not available for the Norway, Asturias, and Navarra centres. High blood pressure was defined as self-reported hypertension at baseline, systolic blood pressure >140 or diastolic blood pressure >90, or self-reported use of hypertension medication. Body mass index was calculated as weight divided by the square of height in meters. HDL cholesterol and total cholesterol levels, measured in baseline serum samples using a Roche MODULAR ANALYTICS EVO analyser, were available in all centres except Norway.

Statistical analyses

Baseline characteristics for the subcohort by parity were presented as means (standard deviation) or medians (interquartile range) for continuous variables and as percentages for categorical variables. Cox proportional hazards models, modified for the case-cohort design using the Prentice method²⁸, were used to estimate hazard ratios and 95% confidence intervals for first-time CHD by parity and breastfeeding history. Participants contributed only the first CHD outcome (whether non-fatal or fatal) experienced during follow-up, so fatal events that followed non-fatal events were not included. Given the multilevel structure of the data, models were first fitted separately within each country before pooling the country-specific estimates by multivariate random-effects meta-analysis using inverse variance weights. Age was used as the underlying time variable, with entry time defined as the participant's age at recruitment, and exit time as the age of first-time CHD, loss-to-follow-up or censoring at the end of the follow-up, whichever came first. The I^2 statistic was used to quantify the percentage of total variability between countries due to between-country heterogeneity. Parity, defined as the number of live births, was categorized as nulliparous (reference), 1 child, 2 children, 3 children, 4 children, or 5 or more children. Breastfeeding history was examined among parous women, comparing women who ever breastfed to women who had never breastfed, and categorized into groups of lifetime duration of breastfeeding (never [reference], >0-<3 months, 3-<6 months, 6-<12 months,

12-<23 months, and 23 months or more), and into groups of mean duration of breastfeeding per live-born child (never [reference], >0-<1 months, 1-<3 months, 3-<6 months, and 6 months or more). Group-specific 95% confidence intervals were estimated only from the variances that correspond to the amount of information underlying each group (including the reference group).²⁹ To assess the combined effect of parity and breastfeeding on CHD risk, we also examined the association between parity, history of breastfeeding and risk of first-time CHD in models including nulliparous women as the reference group.

Models were adjusted for age at study entry and centre (Model I), and then additionally for level of attained education, smoking status, and parity (for breastfeeding history only) (Model II), followed by further adjustment for other confounders and potential mediators (history of high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI) (Model III). Model III was used as our primary, most conservative, analyses model. To account for the impact of missing covariate data on our results, we restricted our main analyses to individuals with complete data for all models. Secondary analyses allowed the set of individuals to vary between models and used all individuals with non-missing values for the covariates separately for each model. To investigate whether age or number of live births modified the association between parity or breastfeeding with CHD risk, we calculated the HRs for CHD in women <55 years versus ≥ 55 years of age, and in women with 1 or 2 children versus those with 3 children or more. Statistical interaction was evaluated by adding a cross-product term to the country-specific regression models and pooling these using random-effects meta-analysis. In a sensitivity analysis, we excluded women younger than 45 in whom reproductive history may not yet be complete. All statistical analyses were performed using STATA, version 12.0 (Stata, College Station, TX).

Results

The baseline characteristics of the 9,985 women in the subcohort with information on reproductive history are shown in Table 1. The mean (SD) age at entry was 52.7 (9.1) years, 88% of these women were parous, of these 87% had ever breastfed. Women who were parous had a lower level of attained education, had higher levels of BMI, and were less likely to smoke than those who were nulliparous. During a median follow-up of 11.1 years (interquartile range 8.0-13.4), 5,138 of 14,890 women developed CHD, of whom 206 were also in the subcohort. Supplementary Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for main characteristics by centre.

Parity and risk of coronary heart disease

Of 12,481 women with complete data, 3,336 developed CHD during follow-up. The HR (95% CI) for CHD in parous versus nulliparous women was 1.25 (1.07, 1.46) in the age- and country stratified model and attenuated to 1.19 (1.03, 1.38) following adjustment for potential confounders and mediators (Table 2). The I^2 statistic for the multiple-adjusted analyses was 29% (0%-67%), indicating that there was moderate heterogeneity between countries. Compared to nulliparous women, the multiple-adjusted HRs for CHD were 1.16 (0.89, 1.51), 1.14 (1.02, 1.28), 1.16 (0.96, 1.41), 1.40 (1.18, 1.66), and 2.03 (1.27, 3.26) for women with 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 or more children, respectively (Table 2 and Figure 1). Results were similar in analyses

including the largest set of women with complete data available, irrespective of incomplete data in subsequent models, or when restricting the analyses to women aged 45 years or older at study entry (Supplementary Tables 2 and 3).

Breastfeeding history and risk of coronary heart disease

Data on breastfeeding history were available on 12,779 parous women and 4348 CHD events; 8,074 women (2,404 CHD events) had complete data on all variables. Parous women who had ever breastfed had a multiple-adjusted HR for CHD of 0.70 (95% CI: 0.50, 0.97) compared with parous women who never breastfed (Table 2). There was substantial heterogeneity between countries; the I^2 statistic was 82% (65%-91%). Compared with parous women who had never breastfed, women with a lifetime duration of breastfeeding of >0-<3 months, 3-<6 months, 6-<12 months, 12-<23 months, or 23 months or more had a multiple-adjusted HR for CHD of 0.71 (0.59, 0.86), 0.67 (0.57, 0.79), 0.68 (0.55, 0.84), 0.61 (0.52, 0.71), and 0.59 (0.44, 0.79), respectively (Figure 2 and Table 2). Similar results were obtained in the analyses on the mean duration of breastfeeding per child and CHD risk (Figure 3 and Table 2). Analyses restricted to women 45 years or older or including women with missing data on some covariables did not change the findings materially (Supplementary Tables 2 and 3).

Combination of parity and breastfeeding and risk of coronary heart disease

Analyses of the combination of parity and breastfeeding indicated that parous women who had ever breastfed were at a similar risk of CHD compared to nulliparous women (HR: 0.92 [0.62, 1.37]; Table 3). There was no significant evidence for a higher risk of CHD in parous women who had never breastfed (HR: 1.27 [0.72, 2.24]), although power to detect weak effects was limited.

Subgroup analyses

Analyses in subgroups of women younger than 55 years versus those 55 years or above at study entry provided no evidence for a different effect of parity by age, and neither did the association between number of children and risk of CHD differ between the age groups (Table 4). A history of breastfeeding was associated with similar reductions in risk of CHD in younger as in older women, and in women with 1 or 2 children as in those with 3 or more children. The associations between lifetime duration of breastfeeding and duration of breastfeeding per child and CHD risk also did not differ between age groups or by parity (Table 4).

Discussion

In this case-cohort analysis, nested within the 10-country EPIC prospective cohort study, we examined the separate and combined associations of parity and breastfeeding on the risk of incident CHD. Our main findings are threefold.

First, we report that parous women are at higher risk of CHD as compared to nulliparous women; with the highest risk seen among women who had the most offspring. These findings, therefore, add to the accumulating evidence that repeated

pregnancies could result in an accumulation of cardiometabolic changes, including elevated pro-atherogenic lipid levels, accumulation of abdominal fat, endothelial dysfunction, and increased systemic inflammation,^{1, 30} that may have permanent effects on the cardiovascular system, leading to a higher risk of CHD later in life.³⁻⁷

Second, in agreement with previous observations that breastfeeding is associated with lower risk of the metabolic syndrome,¹⁵ hypertension,^{16, 17} and diabetes,¹⁸⁻²¹ our study supports the existence of inverse associations between breastfeeding and CHD risk. Previous studies have reported that prolonged periods of breastfeeding could have beneficial effects on maternal cardiovascular risk factors, including on lipids, blood pressure, insulin and glucose homeostasis, and body mass index.^{12, 31} Our results extend previous work by supporting the possibility of stronger inverse associations between breastfeeding and CHD risk among women who had longer cumulative lifelong duration of breastfeeding. However, the dose-response curve between breastfeeding and CHD risk requires further investigation, since it may be context-dependent. For example, a previous study of more than 20,000 Norwegian women reported that breastfeeding was associated with a lower risk of CVD mortality, potentially in a U-shaped fashion, but only among parous women younger than 65 years at study baseline.²² Results from the Nurses' Health Study suggested that the association between lifetime duration of breastfeeding and risk of incident CHD was characterized by a threshold effect; only women with lifetime duration of two years or more had a significantly lower risk of incident CHD compared to women who had never breastfed.²³ Conversely, while a history of breastfeeding was associated with a slightly lower risk of fatal CHD in a cohort of 267,400 women from Shanghai, increasing duration of breastfeeding did not strengthen the association.¹⁰

Third, our study constitutes one of the few available analyses of the combined associations of parity and breastfeeding on the incidence of CHD. We found that women who both had children and breastfed did not have a higher risk of CHD, which is consistent with the notion that the physiological changes in pregnancy could reverse more quickly and more completely with breastfeeding, which in turn may confer cardiovascular protection later in life.¹¹

Our observations are consistent with the conclusions of previous studies that attempted to disentangle biological processes related to pregnancy from lifestyle factors related to childrearing by comparing results from men and women within the same cohort. For example, a study among men from prospective cohorts in the US found no relationship between the number of children and the paternal risk of CHD,³² whereas there was a positive association between having 6 or more pregnancies and CHD risk among women from the same cohort.⁵ A cross-sectional analysis of men and women from the British Women's Heart and Health Study and the British Regional Heart Study reported that having more offspring was associated with higher body mass index for both male and female parents, and with more adverse lipid profiles and diabetes in women only.⁶ However, as there was a positive association between parity and CHD among women (but not men) in these cohorts, the authors concluded that the biological effects of pregnancy in women persist into later life.

The strengths and potential limitations of our study merit consideration. Our analysis maximized power and efficiency by conducting a case-cohort analysis of incident CHD in the large prospective EPIC cohort, thereby focusing measurement of lipids and other biochemical risk factors on the most relevant subset of the cohort. The validity of our findings was enhanced by our ability to adjust for a range of relevant covariates, and by the robustness of our results to a variety of sensitivity and subgroup analyses. The generalisability of our findings was enhanced by the inclusion of women from 10 diverse European countries. However, we cannot discount the possibility that the associations observed in this study were, at least partly, due to unmeasured or residual confounding. For example, confounding is a major concern in studies of breastfeeding and health outcomes, because mothers who breastfeed are more likely to engage in other health-promoting behaviours.³³⁻³⁵ Nevertheless, we found that adjustment in our study for several relevant factors did not materially affect the relationships we observed. Our study had insufficient data to account for CHD risk factors before or during pregnancy that determine breastfeeding initiation and duration as well as future CHD risk, leaving our results potential liable to “reverse causality”. For example, women with pre-existing CHD risk factors such as obesity, type 1 diabetes, preeclampsia, or polycystic ovary syndrome, might be less likely to initiate breastfeeding and or could breastfeed for shorter durations than women without these CHD risk factors. Because our study involved self-reported information on parity and breastfeeding, information that was sometimes recalled and recorded decades after childbirth and weaning (with the added limitation that duration of breastfeeding was recorded in EPIC only for a woman’s first three children and final child), the true strength of any associations we observed could have been underestimated. Data on the number of children in men was not available, so we were no able to dissect whether the association between parity and CHD was due to biological effects of childbearing or factors related to childrearing. Finally, we noted between-country heterogeneity in some of our results, a finding which requires further investigation.

In conclusion, this analysis of women from 10 European countries found that having more children was associated with a higher risk of CHD later in life, whereas breastfeeding was associated with a lower CHD risk. Women who both had children and breastfed did not have a higher risk of CHD, suggesting the need for studies to determine whether breastfeeding can compensate for the CHD risk associated with greater parity.

274 **Funding**

275 EPIC-CVD has been supported by the European Union Framework 7 (HEALTH-F2-2012-279233), the European Research
276 Council (268834), the UK Medical Research Council (G0800270 and MR/L003120/1), the British Heart Foundation (SP/09/002
277 and RG/08/014 and RG13/13/30194), and the UK National Institute of Health Research. EPIC Asturias was also supported by
278 the Regional Government of Asturias. EPIC-Greece is also supported by the Hellenic Health Foundation. EPIC-Oxford was also
279 supported by the UK Medical Research Council (MR/M012190/1) and Cancer Research UK (570/A16491). EPIC-Ragusa was
280 also supported by the Sicilian Government, AIRE ONLUS Ragusa, and AVIS Ragusa. EPIC-Turin was supported also by the
281 Compagnia di San Paolo and the Human Genetics Foundation-Torino (HuGeF).

282

283 **Acknowledgements**

284 We thank all EPIC participants and staff for their contribution to the study. We thank staff from the EPIC-CVD and EPIC-
285 InterAct Coordinating Centres for carrying out sample preparation and data-handling work, particularly Sarah Spackman
286 (EPIC-CVD Data Manager).

287

288 **Conflicts of interest**

289 None

290 References

- 291 1. Lain KY, Catalano PM. Metabolic changes in pregnancy. *Clinical obstetrics and gynecology* 2007; **50**(4): 938-48.
- 292 2. Sanghavi M, Rutherford JD. Cardiovascular physiology of pregnancy. *Circulation* 2014; **130**(12): 1003-8.
- 293 3. Parikh NI, Cnattingius S, Dickman PW, Mittleman MA, Ludvigsson JF, Ingelsson E. Parity and risk of later-life maternal
- 294 cardiovascular disease. *American heart journal* 2010; **159**(2): 215-21.e6.
- 295 4. Jaffe DH, Eisenbach Z, Manor O. The effect of parity on cause-specific mortality among married men and women.
- 296 *Maternal and child health journal* 2011; **15**(3): 376-85.
- 297 5. Ness RB, Harris T, Cobb J, et al. Number of pregnancies and the subsequent risk of cardiovascular disease. *The New*
- 298 *England journal of medicine* 1993; **328**(21): 1528-33.
- 299 6. Lawlor DA, Emberson JR, Ebrahim S, et al. Is the association between parity and coronary heart disease due to
- 300 biological effects of pregnancy or adverse lifestyle risk factors associated with child-rearing? Findings from the British
- 301 Women's Heart and Health Study and the British Regional Heart Study. *Circulation* 2003; **107**(9): 1260-4.
- 302 7. Koski-Rahikkala H, Pouta A, Pietilainen K, Hartikainen AL. Does parity affect mortality among parous women? *Journal*
- 303 *of epidemiology and community health* 2006; **60**(11): 968-73.
- 304 8. Steenland K, Lally C, Thun M. Parity and coronary heart disease among women in the American Cancer Society CPS II
- 305 population. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass)* 1996; **7**(6): 641-3.
- 306 9. Colditz GA, Willett WC, Stampfer MJ, Rosner B, Speizer FE, Hennekens CH. A prospective study of age at menarche,
- 307 parity, age at first birth, and coronary heart disease in women. *American journal of epidemiology* 1987; **126**(5): 861-70.
- 308 10. Gallagher LG, Davis LB, Ray RM, et al. Reproductive history and mortality from cardiovascular disease among women
- 309 textile workers in Shanghai, China. *International journal of epidemiology* 2011; **40**(6): 1510-8.
- 310 11. Stuebe AM, Rich-Edwards JW. The reset hypothesis: lactation and maternal metabolism. *American journal of*
- 311 *perinatology* 2009; **26**(1): 81-8.
- 312 12. Gunderson EP, Lewis CE, Wei GS, Whitmer RA, Quesenberry CP, Sidney S. Lactation and changes in maternal
- 313 metabolic risk factors. *Obstetrics and gynecology* 2007; **109**(3): 729-38.
- 314 13. Schwarz EB, Ray RM, Stuebe AM, et al. Duration of lactation and risk factors for maternal cardiovascular disease.
- 315 *Obstetrics and gynecology* 2009; **113**(5): 974-82.
- 316 14. McClure CK, Catov JM, Ness RB, Schwarz EB. Lactation and maternal subclinical cardiovascular disease among
- 317 premenopausal women. *American journal of obstetrics and gynecology* 2012; **207**(1): 46.e1-8.
- 318 15. Gunderson EP, Jacobs DR, Jr., Chiang V, et al. Duration of lactation and incidence of the metabolic syndrome in
- 319 women of reproductive age according to gestational diabetes mellitus status: a 20-Year prospective study in CARDIA
- 320 (Coronary Artery Risk Development in Young Adults). *Diabetes* 2010; **59**(2): 495-504.
- 321 16. Lee SY, Kim MT, Jee SH, Yang HP. Does long-term lactation protect premenopausal women against hypertension risk?
- 322 A Korean women's cohort study. *Preventive medicine* 2005; **41**(2): 433-8.
- 323 17. Stuebe AM, Schwarz EB, Grewen K, et al. Duration of lactation and incidence of maternal hypertension: a longitudinal
- 324 cohort study. *American journal of epidemiology* 2011; **174**(10): 1147-58.
- 325 18. Jager S, Jacobs S, Kroger J, et al. Breast-feeding and maternal risk of type 2 diabetes: a prospective study and meta-
- 326 analysis. *Diabetologia* 2014; **57**(7): 1355-65.
- 327 19. Stuebe AM, Rich-Edwards JW, Willett WC, Manson JE, Michels KB. Duration of lactation and incidence of type 2
- 328 diabetes. *JAMA : the journal of the American Medical Association* 2005; **294**(20): 2601-10.
- 329 20. Villegas R, Gao YT, Yang G, et al. Duration of breast-feeding and the incidence of type 2 diabetes mellitus in the
- 330 Shanghai Women's Health Study. *Diabetologia* 2008; **51**(2): 258-66.
- 331 21. Aune D, Norat T, Romundstad P, Vatten LJ. Breastfeeding and the maternal risk of type 2 diabetes: a systematic
- 332 review and dose-response meta-analysis of cohort studies. *Nutrition, metabolism, and cardiovascular diseases : NMCD* 2014;
- 333 **24**(2): 107-15.
- 334 22. Natland Fagerhaug T, Forsmo S, Jacobsen GW, Midthjell K, Andersen LF, Ivar Lund Nilsen T. A prospective population-
- 335 based cohort study of lactation and cardiovascular disease mortality: the HUNT study. *BMC public health* 2013; **13**: 1070.
- 336 23. Stuebe AM, Michels KB, Willett WC, Manson JE, Rexrode K, Rich-Edwards JW. Duration of lactation and incidence of
- 337 myocardial infarction in middle to late adulthood. *American journal of obstetrics and gynecology* 2009; **200**(2): 138 e1-8.
- 338 24. Merritt MA, Riboli E, Murphy N, et al. Reproductive factors and risk of mortality in the European Prospective
- 339 Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition; a cohort study. *BMC medicine* 2015; **13**: 252.

- 340 25. Riboli E, Hunt KJ, Slimani N, et al. European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC): study
341 populations and data collection. *Public health nutrition* 2002; **5**(6b): 1113-24.
- 342 26. Danesh J, Saracci R, Berglund G, et al. EPIC-Heart: the cardiovascular component of a prospective study of nutritional,
343 lifestyle and biological factors in 520,000 middle-aged participants from 10 European countries. *European journal of*
344 *epidemiology* 2007; **22**(2): 129-41.
- 345 27. Langenberg C, Sharp S, Forouhi NG, et al. Design and cohort description of the InterAct Project: an examination of the
346 interaction of genetic and lifestyle factors on the incidence of type 2 diabetes in the EPIC Study. *Diabetologia* 2011; **54**(9):
347 2272-82.
- 348 28. Prentice RL. A case-cohort design for epidemiologic cohort studies and disease prevention trials. *Biometrika* 1986;
349 **73**(1): 1-11.
- 350 29. Easton DF, Peto J, Babiker AG. Floating absolute risk: an alternative to relative risk in survival and case-control analysis
351 avoiding an arbitrary reference group. *Statistics in medicine* 1991; **10**(7): 1025-35.
- 352 30. Stewart FM, Freeman DJ, Ramsay JE, Greer IA, Caslake M, Ferrell WR. Longitudinal assessment of maternal
353 endothelial function and markers of inflammation and placental function throughout pregnancy in lean and obese mothers.
354 *The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism* 2007; **92**(3): 969-75.
- 355 31. Natland ST, Nilsen TI, Midthjell K, Andersen LF, Forsmo S. Lactation and cardiovascular risk factors in mothers in a
356 population-based study: the HUNT-study. *International breastfeeding journal* 2012; **7**(1): 8.
- 357 32. Ness RB, Cobb J, Harris T, D'Agostino RB. Does number of children increase the rate of coronary heart disease in men?
358 *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass)* 1995; **6**(4): 442-5.
- 359 33. Beck LF, Morrow B, Lipscomb LE, et al. Prevalence of selected maternal behaviors and experiences, Pregnancy Risk
360 Assessment Monitoring System (PRAMS), 1999. *Morbidity and mortality weekly report Surveillance summaries (Washington,*
361 *DC : 2002)* 2002; **51**(2): 1-27.
- 362 34. Pesa JA, Shelton MM. Health-enhancing behaviors correlated with breastfeeding among a national sample of
363 mothers. *Public health nursing (Boston, Mass)* 1999; **16**(2): 120-4.
- 364 35. Yngve A, Sjostrom M. Breastfeeding determinants and a suggested framework for action in Europe. *Public health*
365 *nutrition* 2001; **4**(2b): 729-39.

Figure legend

Figure 1: Adjusted hazard ratios (with group-specific 95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease associated with number of live born children.

The highest category of live born children (5 or more) is plotted at 5.5.

Figure 2: Adjusted hazard ratios (with group-specific 95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease associated with lifetime duration of breastfeeding in parous women.

Categories are never, 0-<3 months, 3-<6 months, 6-<12 months, 12-<23 months, and 23 months or more. On the x-axis, results are placed on the mean lifetime duration of breastfeeding within category.

Figure 3: Adjusted hazard ratios (with group-specific 95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease associated with mean duration of breastfeeding per live born child.

Categories are never, 0-<1 months, 1-<3 months, 3-<6 months, and 6 months or more. On the x-axis, results are placed on the mean duration of breastfeeding per child within category.

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of women in the EPIC-CVD subcohort by parity

| | Overall subcohort | Nulliparous | Parous |
|--|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| <i>N</i> (% of overall subcohort) | 9,985 | 1,220 (12.2) | 8,765 (87.8) |
| Age at study entry, years | 52.7 (9.1) | 52.7 (10.1) | 52.7 (9.0) |
| Education level, % | | | |
| None | 11.3 | 7.0 | 11.9 |
| Primary | 34.3 | 23.9 | 35.8 |
| Secondary | 15.4 | 18.2 | 15.0 |
| Tertiary | 39.0 | 50.9 | 37.4 |
| Current smoker, % | 21.7 | 25.4 | 21.1 |
| History of diabetes, % | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.7 |
| BMI, kg/m ² | 26.1 (4.7) | 24.9 (4.3) | 26.2 (4.7) |
| Systolic blood pressure, mmHg | 130.8 (20.0) | 129.6 (20.4) | 131.0 (19.9) |
| Diastolic blood pressure, mmHg | 80.3 (10.6) | 79.2 (10.4) | 80.5 (10.6) |
| History of high blood pressure, % | 34.3 | 30.1 | 34.9 |
| Total cholesterol, mmol/L | 6.0 (1.1) | 6.0 (1.2) | 6.0 (1.1) |
| HDL cholesterol, mmol/L | 1.6 (0.4) | 1.7 (0.4) | 1.6 (0.4) |
| Postmenopausal, % | 52.7 | 53.9 | 52.5 |
| Age at menopause [†] | 48.5 (4.9) | 48.1 (5.3) | 48.6 (4.9) |
| Number of children*, % | | | |
| 1 child | - | - | 14.8 |
| 2 children | - | - | 47.5 |
| ≥3 children | - | - | 37.7 |
| History of breastfeeding*, % | - | - | 87.2 |
| Lifetime duration of breastfeeding*, months | - | - | 6.4 (3.0, 13.0) |
| Duration of breastfeeding per child*, months | - | - | 3.0 (1.5, 6.0) |

Values are mean (standard deviation) or median (25th and 75th percentile) for continuous variables. † postmenopausal women only, *parous women only.

Table 2: Hazard ratios (95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease associated with parity in all women and history of breastfeeding in parous women only

| | Model I | Model II | Model III |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Parity | | | |
| N | 12,481 | 12,481 | 12,481 |
| Parous (yes vs. no) | 1.25 (1.07, 1.46) | 1.23 (1.05, 1.43) | 1.19 (1.03, 1.38) |
| I ² for heterogeneity (95% CI) | 40% (0%, 72%) | 40% (0%, 72%) | 29% (0%, 67%) |
| Number of children | | | |
| None | 1.00 (0.84, 1.19) | 1.00 (0.83, 1.20) | 1.00 (0.85, 1.18) |
| 1 child | 1.18 (0.97, 1.43) | 1.13 (0.93, 1.38) | 1.16 (0.89, 1.51) |
| 2 children | 1.20 (1.10, 1.32) | 1.16 (1.12, 1.20) | 1.14 (1.02, 1.28) |
| 3 children | 1.23 (1.07, 1.41) | 1.21 (1.04, 1.41) | 1.16 (0.96, 1.41) |
| 4 children | 1.51 (1.27, 1.79) | 1.49 (1.23, 1.79) | 1.40 (1.18, 1.66) |
| 5 or more children | 2.28 (1.51, 3.45) | 2.05 (1.31, 3.22) | 2.03 (1.27, 3.26) |
| History of breastfeeding | | | |
| N | 8,074 | 8,074 | 8,074 |
| Ever breastfed (yes vs. no) | 0.68 (0.59, 0.80) | 0.61 (0.50, 0.74) | 0.70 (0.50, 0.97) |
| I ² for heterogeneity | 54% (0%, 80%) | 62% (12%, 83%) | 82% (65%, 91%) |
| Lifetime duration of breastfeeding | | | |
| Never breastfed | 1.00 (0.83, 1.21) | 1.00 (0.83, 1.23) | 1.00 (0.73, 1.37) |
| >0 to <3 months | 0.67 (0.59, 0.77) | 0.66 (0.57, 0.77) | 0.71 (0.59, 0.86) |
| ≥3 to <6 months | 0.70 (0.58, 0.85) | 0.69 (0.59, 0.81) | 0.67 (0.57, 0.79) |
| ≥6 to <12 months | 0.72 (0.61, 0.84) | 0.67 (0.57, 0.79) | 0.68 (0.55, 0.84) |
| ≥12 to <23 months | 0.63 (0.57, 0.70) | 0.60 (0.52, 0.70) | 0.61 (0.52, 0.71) |
| ≥23 months | 0.63 (0.48, 0.83) | 0.56 (0.43, 0.73) | 0.59 (0.44, 0.79) |
| Duration of breastfeeding per child | | | |
| Never breastfed | 1.00 (0.88, 1.14) | 1.00 (0.85, 1.18) | 1.00 (0.74, 1.35) |
| >0 to <1 months | 0.82 (0.71, 0.95) | 0.75 (0.64, 0.89) | 0.82 (0.68, 0.98) |
| ≥1 to <3 months | 0.73 (0.65, 0.81) | 0.71 (0.64, 0.79) | 0.70 (0.65, 0.76) |
| ≥3 to <6 months | 0.69 (0.57, 0.84) | 0.66 (0.57, 0.78) | 0.69 (0.60, 0.80) |
| ≥6 months | 0.64 (0.53, 0.78) | 0.66 (0.54, 0.81) | 0.66 (0.57, 0.77) |

Hazard ratios are from Prentice-weighted Cox proportional hazards models stratified by country and with age as timescale. Analyses of parity are conducted in all women. Analyses of breastfeeding are conducted in parous women only.

Model I: Adjusted for age at study entry and centre; Model II: model I + level of attained education, smoking status, and number of live born children (for breastfeeding only); Model III: model II + high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI.

Table 3: Hazard ratios (95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease associated with the combined effects of parity and a history of breastfeeding

| | Nulliparous | Parous – never breastfed | Parous – ever breastfed |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Model I | 1.00 [reference] | 1.63 (1.26, 2.11) | 1.13 (0.95, 1.35) |
| Model II | 1.00 [reference] | 1.50 (1.07, 2.11) | 0.91 (0.63, 1.31) |
| Model III | 1.00 [reference] | 1.27 (0.72, 2.24) | 0.92 (0.62, 1.37) |

Hazard ratios are from Prentice-weighted Cox proportional hazards models stratified by country and with age as timescale. Model I: Adjusted for age at study entry and centre; Model II: model I + level of attained education, smoking status, and number of live born children; Model III: model II + high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI.

Table 4: Hazard ratios (95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease by parity and history of breastfeeding in subgroups

| | Age | | | Parity | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | <55 years | 55 years or older | P for interaction | 1-2 children | 3 or more children | P for interaction |
| Parous (yes vs. no) | 1.17 (0.91, 1.52) | 1.19 (0.89, 1.60) | 0.94 | - | - | - |
| Number of children | | | | | | |
| 1 child | 1.37 (0.79, 2.38) | 1.07 (0.63, 1.80) | 0.76 | - | - | - |
| 2 children | 1.12 (0.64, 1.96) | 1.67 (0.79, 3.53) | | - | - | |
| 3 children | 1.15 (0.75, 1.77) | 1.36 (0.94, 1.96) | | - | - | |
| 4 children | 1.13 (0.81, 1.57) | 1.53 (0.45, 5.19) | | - | - | |
| 5 or more children | 1.30 (0.91, 1.87) | 1.84 (1.20, 2.82) | | - | - | |
| History of breastfeeding (yes vs. no) | 0.68 (0.50, 0.93) | 0.72 (0.50, 1.04) | 0.70 | 0.66 (0.45, 0.95) | 0.67 (0.41, 1.08) | 0.91 |
| Lifetime duration of breastfeeding | | | | | | |
| >0 to <3 months | 0.74 (0.49, 1.11) | 0.67 (0.41, 1.10) | 0.31 | 0.67 (0.45, 0.99) | 0.87 (0.53, 1.41) | 0.30 |
| ≥3 to <6 months | 0.51 (0.35, 0.74) | 0.68 (0.40, 1.15) | | 0.63 (0.42, 0.94) | 0.79 (0.51, 1.22) | |
| ≥6 to <12 months | 0.75 (0.46, 1.22) | 0.61 (0.38, 1.01) | | 0.64 (0.36, 1.14) | 0.72 (0.45, 1.17) | |
| ≥12 to <23 months | 0.54 (0.34, 0.86) | 0.60 (0.34, 1.05) | | 0.61 (0.37, 1.01) | 0.65 (0.37, 1.14) | |
| ≥23 months | 0.55 (0.29, 1.04) | 0.55 (0.37, 0.81) | | 1.09 (0.48, 2.48) | 0.62 (0.43, 0.89) | |
| Duration of breastfeeding per child | | | | | | |
| >0 to <1 months | 0.79 (0.54, 1.14) | 0.71 (0.44, 1.15) | 0.68 | 0.65 (0.42, 1.01) | 0.96 (0.66, 1.40) | 0.46 |
| ≥1 to <3 months | 0.59 (0.42, 0.82) | 0.66 (0.43, 1.03) | | 0.67 (0.46, 0.97) | 0.70 (0.44, 1.10) | |
| ≥3 to <6 months | 0.62 (0.40, 0.98) | 0.63 (0.40, 0.99) | | 0.63 (0.40, 0.99) | 0.70 (0.41, 1.17) | |
| ≥6 months | 0.64 (0.44, 0.93) | 0.59 (0.36, 0.97) | | 0.67 (0.43, 1.03) | 0.63 (0.39, 1.01) | |

Hazard ratios are from Prentice-weighted Cox proportional hazards models stratified by country and with age as timescale.

Analyses of parity are conducted in all women; nulliparous women are the reference category. Analyses of breastfeeding are conducted in parous women only; parous women with no history of breastfeeding are the reference category.

Models are adjusted for age at study entry, centre, level of attained education, smoking status, number of live born children (for breastfeeding analyses only), high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI.

Figure 1




Figure 2





Figure 3



Supplementary Table 1: Baseline characteristics for main variables by EPIC centre

| | | | | | Subcohort characteristics | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|----------|--------------|--------|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| Country | EPIC centre | Total, N | Subcohort, N | CHD, N | Age at study entry, years | Current smoker, % | Parous, % | Ever breastfed*, % |
| Denmark | Aarhus | 475 | 312 | 170 | 56.2 (4.4) | 29.9 | 87.2 | 94.1 |
| | Copenhagen | 1,048 | 654 | 408 | 56.6 (4.3) | 37.7 | 87.9 | 92.4 |
| France | France | 593 | 557 | 38 | 56.4 (6.5) | 9.0 | 90.5 | 77.2 |
| Germany | Heidelberg | 554 | 489 | 68 | 49.3 (8.4) | 20.3 | 81.8 | 81.8 |
| | Potsdam | 785 | 709 | 78 | 48.7 (9.2) | 16.8 | 90.7 | 83.7 |
| Greece | Greece | 882 | 766 | 121 | 52.6 (12.2) | 20.4 | 90.6 | 88.3 |
| Italy | Florence | 493 | 420 | 77 | 51.6 (7.6) | 26.0 | 85.2 | 88.2 |
| | Varese | 462 | 293 | 173 | 51.3 (8.2) | 21.2 | 90.4 | 81.9 |
| | Ragusa | 216 | 178 | 39 | 45.9 (7.9) | 23.0 | 85.4 | 89.5 |
| | Turin | 271 | 237 | 36 | 51.1 (7.7) | 20.3 | 83.5 | 72.7 |
| | Naples | 313 | 223 | 93 | 50.1 (7.7) | 35.4 | 91.0 | 91.6 |
| Norway | Norway | 105 | 60 | 45 | 48.7 (4.6) | 29.3 | 93.3 | 96.4 |
| Spain | Asturias | 568 | 480 | 96 | 47.6 (8.1) | 19.0 | 90.6 | 84.7 |
| | Granada | 526 | 436 | 100 | 49.4 (8.4) | 14.5 | 93.1 | 90.4 |
| | Murcia | 585 | 536 | 56 | 47.9 (8.5) | 18.1 | 89.4 | 89.5 |
| | Navarra | 450 | 410 | 41 | 48.6 (7.9) | 23.2 | 85.6 | 93.1 |
| | San Sebastian | 466 | 414 | 59 | 48.2 (7.9) | 18.1 | 89.6 | 86.0 |
| Sweden | Malmo | 1,765 | 1,128 | 679 | 57.1 (8.0) | 28.9 | 86.9 | 95.4 |
| The Netherlands | Utrecht | 1,761 | 914 | 891 | 57.7 (6.0) | 22.0 | 85.7 | 82.6 |
| United Kingdom | Cambridge | 1,457 | 523 | 970 | 59.0 (9.4) | 14.4 | 87.8 | 83.3 |
| | Oxford | 1,142 | 246 | 900 | 49.1 (11.6) | 6.5 | 73.6 | 90.2 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | | 14,917 | 9,985 | 5,138 | 52.7 (9.1) | 21.7 | 87.8 | 87.2 |

* Amongst parous women

Supplementary Table 2: Hazard ratios (95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease associated with parity and history of breastfeeding in women with complete data on all covariates

| | Model I | Model II | Model III |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Parity | | | |
| N | 14,890 | 14,319 | 12,481 |
| Parous (yes vs. no) | 1.19 (1.00, 1.40) | 1.18 (0.99, 1.40) | 1.19 (1.03, 1.38) |
| I ² for heterogeneity (95% CI) | 60% (21%, 80%) | 59% (18%, 80%) | 29% (0%, 67%) |
| Number of children | | | |
| None | | | |
| 1 child | 1.23 (1.06, 1.42) | 1.14 (0.99, 1.31) | 1.16 (0.89, 1.51) |
| 2 children | 1.11 (1.00, 1.23) | 1.11 (1.09, 1.13) | 1.14 (1.02, 1.28) |
| 3 children | 1.14 (0.98, 1.32) | 1.11 (0.98, 1.25) | 1.16 (0.96, 1.41) |
| 4 children | 1.47 (1.24, 1.75) | 1.45 (1.24, 1.70) | 1.40 (1.18, 1.66) |
| 5 or more children | 1.92 (1.34, 2.76) | 2.05 (1.30, 3.24) | 2.03 (1.27, 3.26) |
| History of breastfeeding | | | |
| N | 12,779 | 9,466 | 8,074 |
| Ever breastfed (yes vs. no) | 0.68 (0.59, 0.80) | 0.61 (0.50, 0.74) | 0.70 (0.50, 0.97) |
| I ² for heterogeneity | 55% (8%, 78%) | 61% (16%, 82%) | 82% (65%, 91%) |
| Lifetime duration of breastfeeding | | | |
| Never breastfed | 1.00 (0.86, 1.16) | 1.00 (0.83, 1.21) | 1.00 (0.73, 1.37) |
| >0 to <3 months | 0.71 (0.59, 0.84) | 0.64 (0.53, 0.77) | 0.71 (0.59, 0.86) |
| ≥3 to <6 months | 0.67 (0.56, 0.81) | 0.62 (0.52, 0.74) | 0.67 (0.57, 0.79) |
| ≥6 to <12 months | 0.66 (0.59, 0.75) | 0.62 (0.55, 0.69) | 0.68 (0.55, 0.84) |
| ≥12 to <23 months | 0.62 (0.58, 0.67) | 0.54 (0.49, 0.59) | 0.61 (0.52, 0.71) |
| ≥23 months | 0.56 (0.46, 0.70) | 0.51 (0.41, 0.65) | 0.59 (0.44, 0.79) |
| Mean duration of breastfeeding per child | | | |
| Never breastfed | 1.00 (0.93, 1.08) | 1.00 (0.84, 1.19) | 1.00 (0.74, 1.35) |
| >0 to <1 months | 0.79 (0.68, 0.93) | 0.68 (0.58, 0.81) | 0.82 (0.68, 0.98) |
| ≥1 to <3 months | 0.69 (0.64, 0.75) | 0.64 (0.57, 0.72) | 0.70 (0.65, 0.76) |
| ≥3 to <6 months | 0.59 (0.49, 0.71) | 0.59 (0.52, 0.67) | 0.69 (0.60, 0.80) |
| ≥6 months | 0.56 (0.47, 0.67) | 0.58 (0.50, 0.67) | 0.66 (0.57, 0.77) |

27 individuals with no follow-up were excluded from the analyses. Hazard ratios are from Prentice-weighted Cox proportional hazards models stratified by country and with age at study entry as timescale. Analyses of parity are conducted in all women. Analyses of breastfeeding are conducted in parous women only.

Model I: Adjusted for age at study entry and centre; Model II: model I + level of attained education, smoking status, and number of live born children (for breastfeeding analyses only); Model III: model II + high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI.

Supplementary Table 3: Hazard ratios (95% confidence intervals) for incident coronary heart disease associated with parity and history of breastfeeding in women aged 45 years or older at study entry

| | Model I | Model II | Model III |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Parity | | | |
| N | 12,608 | 12,049 | 10,351 |
| Parous (yes vs. no) | 1.19 (1.00, 1.42) | 1.19 (1.01, 1.41) | 1.19 (1.01, 1.39) |
| I ² for heterogeneity (95% CI) | 62% (24%, 81%) | 55% (8%, 78%) | 38% (0%, 72%) |
| Number of children | | | |
| None | 1.00 (0.82, 1.22) | 1.00 (0.85, 1.18) | 1.00 (0.85, 1.18) |
| 1 child | 1.26 (1.11, 1.44) | 1.18 (1.01, 1.37) | 1.19 (0.93, 1.53) |
| 2 children | 1.11 (1.04, 1.18) | 1.13 (1.11, 1.15) | 1.13 (1.02, 1.26) |
| 3 children | 1.15 (0.98, 1.36) | 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) | 1.15 (0.95, 1.40) |
| 4 children | 1.50 (1.21, 1.86) | 1.51 (1.28, 1.79) | 1.40 (1.17, 1.67) |
| 5 or more children | 1.91 (1.34, 2.71) | 2.02 (1.29, 3.15) | 2.03 (1.27, 3.27) |
| History of breastfeeding | | | |
| N | 10,832 | 8,307 | 6,998 |
| Ever breastfed (yes vs. no) | 0.69 (0.59, 0.81) | 0.61 (0.50, 0.76) | 0.71 (0.51, 1.00) |
| I ² for heterogeneity | 58% (15%, 79%) | 66% (27%, 84%) | 83% (66%, 91%) |
| Lifetime duration of breastfeeding | | | |
| Never breastfed | 1.00 (0.89, 1.13) | 1.00 (0.81, 1.24) | 1.00 (0.72, 1.38) |
| >0 to <3 months | 0.70 (0.60, 0.82) | 0.64 (0.51, 0.80) | 0.71 (0.57, 0.87) |
| ≥3 to <6 months | 0.68 (0.60, 0.79) | 0.61 (0.50, 0.75) | 0.69 (0.58, 0.82) |
| ≥6 to <12 months | 0.70 (0.58, 0.84) | 0.63 (0.56, 0.70) | 0.70 (0.57, 0.86) |
| ≥12 to <23 months | 0.65 (0.57, 0.74) | 0.55 (0.50, 0.61) | 0.64 (0.54, 0.75) |
| ≥23 months | 0.59 (0.46, 0.76) | 0.50 (0.38, 0.65) | 0.61 (0.45, 0.82) |
| Mean duration of breastfeeding per child | | | |
| Never breastfed | 1.00 (0.90, 1.11) | 1.00 (0.83, 1.21) | 1.00 (0.73, 1.37) |
| >0 to <1 months | 0.79 (0.67, 0.94) | 0.67 (0.56, 0.81) | 0.82 (0.67, 1.01) |
| ≥1 to <3 months | 0.71 (0.67, 0.75) | 0.66 (0.59, 0.73) | 0.73 (0.68, 0.79) |
| ≥3 to <6 months | 0.61 (0.50, 0.74) | 0.61 (0.53, 0.69) | 0.71 (0.62, 0.83) |
| ≥6 months | 0.59 (0.49, 0.72) | 0.59 (0.51, 0.69) | 0.70 (0.60, 0.81) |

Hazard ratios are from Prentice-weighted Cox proportional hazards models stratified by country and with age at study entry as timescale. Analyses of parity are conducted in all women. Analyses of breastfeeding are conducted in parous women only.

Model I: Adjusted for age at study entry and centre; Model II: model I + level of attained education, smoking status, and number of live born children (for breastfeeding only); Model III: model II + high blood pressure, HDL cholesterol, total cholesterol, history of diabetes mellitus, and BMI.